

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-8 as follows. Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Egashira (US 6,414,638) and Claims 3, 4, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Egashira and Baldry (US 5,353,036). Claim 7, and Figures 1-4, were objected to.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application.

Egashira discloses a mobile communication terminal which includes an antenna unit having a rod (i.e. whip) antenna which extends from a main body of the terminal and an antenna housing (50) which has a helical antenna (21) therein (Figs. 1 and 2). Egashira further discloses that the rod antenna is retractable and extendable with respect to the antenna housing and a tube (i.e. guide pipe 60) which is disposed in a longitudinal direction of the terminal main body below the antenna housing for receiving the rod antenna.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion that Egashira discloses "a whip antenna 10 having at one end an insulator 12 having a length shorter than a length of the helical antenna" (Office Action, top of page 3), Egashira merely discloses an insulating connecting member 12 which "passes through the helical coil 12 over the entire length thereof" (Col. 10, lines 38-39, emphasis supplied). Therefore, the insulating connecting member (12) disclosed by Egashira is longer than the helical antenna. The insulating connecting member (12) must be longer than the helical antenna in order for the insulating conducting member to sever the "electrical coupling

between the rod-shaped antenna 10 and the helical antenna 20” when the rod antenna is fully retracted (Col. 10, lines 39-41).

In contrast to the longer insulating connecting member (12) of Egashira, Claim 1 recites that the whip antenna has *an insulator having a length shorter than a length of the helical antenna*. Accordingly, Egashira fails to disclose or suggest a whip antenna which has *an insulator having a length shorter than a length of the helical antenna* as in Claim 1, which is the only independent claim pending in this application.

Regarding dependent Claims 3-6, which were rejected in view of the combination of Egashira and Baldry, the Examiner cited Baldry to cure the admitted defect of Egashira failing to disclose “an insulating tube formed in the inner surface of a conductive tube.” (Office Action, bottom of page 3.) In fact, Baldry merely discloses a dielectric tube (6) that is provided with a first conductive coating (9) on its inner bore and a second conductive coating (10) on its outer face (Col. 3, lines 30-46). Baldry emphasizes, in the detailed view provided at Fig. 3, that both conductive coatings (9 and 10) extend the length of the tube. Therefore, any whip antenna that is inserted into the tube (6) of Baldry will contact a conductor, and not an insulator, as in Claim 3.

Accordingly, the combination of Egashira and Baldry fails to teach or suggest at least the limitation of Claim 3, from which Claims 4, 5 and 6 depend, of the conductive tube comprising *on its inner surface an insulating tube for isolation from said whip antenna*.

Finally, in regard to the objection to Figures 1-4 made at the top of page 2 of the Office Action, a Submission Of Replacement Drawings is being contemporaneously filed providing amended Figures 1-4 which include in the legend of each the words "PRIOR ART".

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, i.e. Claims 1-8, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this communication, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
TEL: (516) 228-8484